

1963

the pretense that rulers were omnipotent and that their decrees could be everlasting.

Vigilance is not merely the price of freedom, it has to do with the character of lasting freedom, helping to distinguish it from the euphoria of liberty. Just so, diligence, as a habit, must accompany the attainment of peace in any measure. The security proclaimed by a treaty is, without it, of no more value than a mere proclamation of liberty.

Democracy, within our own land, has kept us working at our freedoms. The art of genuine peacemaking is so embryonic that we do not have the habit—we do not even have a meaningful name for it as yet. The unrelieved ordeal of the cold war and the non-utopian climate of the United Nations—the "one-world" organization, remember?—have taught us that it is work. Hard work. Unending.

The approach to the nuclear control treaty is encouraging evidence that we have learned that progress in international relations requires, as does good government, not the occasional proclamation but the muscle tone of daily effort.

[From the Emmett (Idaho) Messenger-Index, Aug. 22, 1963]

STARK QUESTION

The obvious coolness of many top military leaders toward the test ban treaty is not surprising, and it probably will have more influence on the Senate ratification vote than the outspoken opposition of Dr. Edward Teller, familiarly known as "father of the H-bomb."

As a physicist, Dr. Teller is a genius. As a citizen, his opinion on Emmett's forthcoming decision on a sewage disposal system, for example, would be no more reliable than that of any random resident. As a salesman, a grocery clerk, a millworker, or a football player, he would probably be a flop; and as a political scientist, he is an important threat to the survival of man. Dr. Teller's field of competence is physics.

The same cannot be said for Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, who opposes the test ban, nor of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who have leaned far over to avoid endorsing the treaty without specifically opposing it. These men must be heard, and their opinions must be weighed carefully.

It is unfortunate, however, that their opinions carry more weight than they merit with some Senators, largely because of political considerations. It is unfortunate because the test treaty involves the heart and the soul and will of mankind far more than strictly military defense. It touches closer to the survival of civilization than to military security.

In the areas, the opinion of the man on the street is more valid than that of General Power. Neither the scientist, sane or mad, nor the military expert are of value to America except as their peculiar and admittedly great talents are directed and controlled by the lay-civilian public—a public which doesn't know even the language of science and understands little of military strategy.

We suggest that the Senator should listen carefully to the opinions of all the "Dr. Tellers" and "General Powers." Analyze them carefully in deciding what the vote on the test treaty shall be.

But we suggest, too, that the Senator should seek the opinion of the Emmett store clerk and the migrant fruitworker, for their opinions, whether coinciding or conflicting with those already heard, are more likely to bear on the question at issue.

And the question at issue is not whether the treaty will last or whether Russia will cheat. It is not whether Russia has lived up to agreements in the past. It is not

whether we have more bombs and Russia has bigger ones. It is not, in fact, whether the treaty might give one side or the other some tenuous military advantage.

Neither side can cheat substantially for long. Neither side is constrained by the treaty to reduce its absolute capability of utterly destroying the organized society of the other (and committing national suicide at the same time). Neither side is prohibited from withdrawing on short notice, or no notice at all. Neither side, in fact, is enjoined to reduce by so much as one firecracker a stockpile of weapons already in being equivalent to 10 tons of exploding dynamite for every man, woman and child on the face of the earth.

The question at issue in ratifying the treaty—in trying it at least for a while—is stark and simple:

If it is impossible for conflicting nations armed with unlimited atomic power to negotiate, after years of effort, such a minor agreement as a partial ban on nuclear bomb testing, is there any real hope at all that those nations can avoid the ultimate fission-fusion-fission showdown?

We believe that you, gentle reader, are better qualified to answer that question than the physicists or the generals.

In final analysis, only you can answer the question, either by remaining silent or by functioning as a member of the Republic and of the human race.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Vietnamese problem continues to trouble the Government, people, and press of this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two pertinent articles—a column by Drew Pearson, which appeared in many newspapers, including the September 15 issue of the Idaho Falls Post-Register; and an editorial, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Another Method of Dealing with the Diem Clique," which was reprinted in the September 13 issue of the Lewiston Morning Tribune.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register, Sept. 15, 1963]

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—When Senator FRANK CHURCH, the young Idaho Democrat, put the State Department on the spot at a closed-door hearing regarding its vacillating policy toward South Vietnam, he knew firsthand what he was talking about.

CHURCH made a memorable trip to Saigon 1 year ago with Senators GALE McGEE, Wyoming, and TIM MOSS, Utah, also Democrats. They arrived in Saigon 1 day early. If they had arrived on time they would not have seen so much.

But arriving as they did, they were shunted to one side by the police to make way for President Diem.

"The entire population was pushed to one side," CHURCH reported to other Senators, "some of them had to retreat half a block back from the main street."

"Then a motorcycle escort came charging down the street at 60 miles an hour in front of the President. I have seldom seen so many troops lining a street. In 10 minutes Diem got through the heart of the city—a trip which should have taken 30 minutes. That is how he deals with his citizens."

Later, the three Senators found that the President of South Vietnam treated U.S. Senators with almost equal contempt even

though these Senators have to vote the millions of foreign aid which pay for Diem's troops, his motorcycles and his limousine.

Diem gave the three Senators a 30-minute audience during which he lectured for 30 minutes. It was a monolog. They were not permitted to ask questions. At the conclusion, Ambassador Frederick Nolting was permitted to ask one question. That was all.

During an American Embassy party, Senator CHURCH told guests about the wild ride through the center of the city.

"Oh," remarked one U.S. diplomat, "that's the way of life around here."

CURBING A MANDARIN

The same Senator CHURCH was listening to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman before a closed door meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs. Hilsman gave rather a placid explanation of the State Department's predicament in South Vietnam.

When he finished Church asked in acid tones:

"What are you going to do about this Mandarin? There has been nothing like him since the Borgias."

"This self-immolation by Buddhist priests has shocked the entire Christian world. No matter how we may look at it here, it puts us on the side of religious repression, a position which I know is not that of the American people."

At this, Assistant Secretary Hilsman lost his composure. "I agree," he interrupted. He even agreed that it might be a good thing for the Senate to adopt a resolution threatening to cut off aid to President Diem and his high-handed brother and sister-in-law.

Senator CHURCH has now done so. One of the first to join him was Senator FRANK CARLSON, Kansas Republican, who also was shocked at the high-handed operations of the Diem family and asked some tough questions of Assistant Secretary Hilsman.

A CATHOLIC VIEW

A completely opposite view of South Vietnam and the persecution of Buddhist priests by the Catholic Diem family has been expressed in the Catholic News, organ of the Archdiocese of Cardinal Spellman of New York. It was Cardinal Spellman, who arrived in Saigon on January 5, 1955, to help Catholic refugees from North Vietnam and who has been a strong proponent of U.S. aid to this area. The United States gave \$28,571,428 for these refugees on December 21, 1954.

According to Father Patrick O'Connor, Far Eastern correspondent for National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service, "Buddhists in South Vietnam have been selling the American people a bill of goods. They sold it first to some of the foreign correspondents in Saigon."

"They have represented themselves as undergoing religious persecution. They have been depicted around the world as suffering from a host of restrictions on their religious worship. They are described as comprising sometimes 70 percent of the population persecuted by a 'Catholic minority government.'"

On the other hand, "Vietnam has impressed me as a country of religious tolerance," Ambassador Nolting is quoted as saying to the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Bishop Peter Carreto of Thailand is also quoted by the Catholic News that "U.S. newspapers give a slanted view" of events in Vietnam. He described charges that President Diem is trying to suppress Buddhism as "absurd."

A sympathetic view of the Buddhists' reported plight has been taken by Pope Paul, who recently avoided seeing President Diem's

17378

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 30

brother, Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc. When Archbishop Thuc called at the Vatican, issuing derogatory statements against the Buddhists, he was promptly ordered not to talk about conditions in Vietnam. He left for New York without seeing the Pope.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Sept. 13, 1963]

ANOTHER METHOD OF DEALING WITH THE DIEM CLIQUE

Most Americans, we think, will sympathize with Senators CHURCH of Idaho and CARLSON of Kansas when they express indignation over the highhanded activities of the venal Ngo Dinh Diem clique in South Vietnam. Senator CHURCH says that unless the Diem family undertakes drastic reforms he may offer a resolution to shut off all U.S. aid, now running at a rate of \$500 million a year. Seconding this proposal, Senator CARLSON says "we are just wasting money on this dictator government."

It is not likely that Diem, or his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, or whoever is in charge in Saigon, will effect reforms needed to put a popular base under the Government and conclude the war against the Communist guerrillas. It is clear that the Diem family has no interest other than holding power, and the United States will get nowhere until the family is thrown out.

If the United States continues to support Diem in spite of deteriorating relations, it will steadily lose prestige and also lose the chance of friendly relations with the Vietnamese people who blame the Americans for supporting a repressive government. So it is difficult to see what the United States has to gain by this miserable policy.

What would happen if aid were cut off? The Diem regime would collapse, of course. And possibly the Communists in the north would move in and take control of the south, but that is not certain; the North Vietnam Communists have serious factional problems. Suppose aid were withdrawn progressively, in small bits, as a lever to force reform?

That has an attractiveness, but once the process was started Vietnam would be on notice that the United States had lost confidence in the regime, and that would likely bring it down quickly. What needs to be done now is quietly to encourage the regime's growing number of opponents so that the Vietnamese themselves are enabled to throw out the oppressors. That would avoid a possible period of anarchy.

If this procedure proves impossible, it would then be time to consider the course mentioned by Senators CHURCH and CARLSON. On careful analysis it might be found that the consequences would not be as bad as they might seem. In any event, they could hardly be much worse for the United States than pursuit of the present policy.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

AMBASSADOR LODGE'S DIFFICULT JOB IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, all Americans respect Henry Cabot Lodge for accepting the difficult job of Ambassador to South Vietnam. We can well understand his indignation at Madame Nhu's charges that American junior officers in Vietnam are "little soldiers of fortune." This kind of calumny is too much for any American to take. As David Halberstam, New York Times correspondent in South Vietnam, pointed out in his dispatch published in the September 27 issue of the Times:

Mr. Ngo Dinh Nhu, whose husband is the principal adviser to President Ngo Dinh Diem, his brother, has been outspoken about President Kennedy, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Ameri-

can press, the Bill of Rights, and American culture. However, she had never before attacked the junior officers, many of whom are in the field with the South Vietnamese forces fighting the Communist guerrillas.

The New York Times has editorially supported Ambassador Lodge in its issue of September 27. I wish to call special attention to the convincing conclusion of this editorial:

President Diem must decide whether he is fighting for his family or for his country, and whether he can afford to permit unbridled license to his sister-in-law, who is developing into the Communists' best ally in his own palace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. LODGE'S STATEMENT

Ambassador Lodge has exploded a political bombshell in Saigon by publicly slapping down Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu for her "shocking, cruel, and insulting" aspersions on American junior officers helping South Vietnam to fight the war against the Communists. In statements never repudiated by President Diem's government, the President's sharp-tongued sister-in-law called the junior officers "little soldiers of fortune" engaging in "irresponsible behavior."

Mme. Nhu, whose equally shocking statements about the protesting Buddhists have compromised the Diem government in the eyes of the world, has often been critical of American policy. That is her privilege, but it is not her privilege to impugn the integrity of American officers and soldiers who are being killed in a strange land, side by side with their Vietnamese comrades. Mr. Lodge said they deserve thanks, not insults.

The Ambassador's statement, long overdue, marks a break with the previous American efforts to get along with the Diem regime at all costs. It deals only with one limited aspect of the war. But it has, of course, wider implications for the future relations of the United States with the Diem government.

President Diem must decide whether he is fighting for his family or for his country, and whether he can afford to permit unbridled license to his sister-in-law, who is developing into the Communists' best ally right in his own palace.

PROXMIRE DAIRY PLAN IS WORTH TRYING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly be asked to consider the dairy bill, S. 1915, which I have sponsored and which was reported from the Senate Agriculture Committee by an 11 to 4 vote.

In the Prairie Farmer for September 7, 1963, appeared an excellent editorial analyzing this bill. I wish to call the editorial to the attention of all members of the Senate who will be voting on this proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "New Dairy Plan Is Worth Trying."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Prairie Farmer, Sept. 7, 1963]

NEW DAIRY PLAN IS WORTH TRYING

Dairy leaders who have been working persistently for the last couple of years to reach agreement on sensible, middle-of-the-

road legislation have come up with something that we believe is worth trying. Most of the ideas are involved in the Proxmire bill (S. 1915) which has been reported out of the Senate Agriculture Committee by an 11 to 4 vote.

This is a voluntary plan which would give producers of grade A fluid milk price protection on acceptance of a quota and an historical base. It embodies the class I base idea which has been popping up in most of the legislative proposals and has been recommended by the leadership of the Pure Milk Association.

Under the proposed bill class I producers would agree to limit their production in exchange for certain protections. The most attractive thing about the plan is that it promises to get expanding class I producers off the backs of the class III producers who have been left out in the cold by our Federal orders.

The blend system of pricing milk which gives the grade A producer a fluid-milk price for a part of his output and dumps the rest on the manufactured-milk market at whatever it will bring, has about outlived its usefulness. In the Chicago market during the month of June only 46 percent of the grade A milk was sold for fluid use and 54 percent went into production of butter and cheese. This may not be so surprising out here in the Midwest, but the proportion is even worse in New York State where there is very little justification for producing milk to make manufactured items. In New York the proportion of grade A milk going for butter and cheese has risen lately to as high as 58 percent.

It should also be noted that there has been a rather gratifying decrease in the amount of class III milk produced outside the marketing orders, and at the same time a rather alarming increase in the amount of milk produced under class I. Obviously curtailment of production should come in the fluid-milk areas. Under the present system a class I producer dilutes his income, and the class III producer gets clobbered by his larger and more successful competitor.

Prairie Farmer has been opposed; generally speaking, to any two-price system applied to an agricultural product. We have been against such a system in wheat. We have been reluctant to accept it even in the dairy field. However, there is increasing evidence that dairying is a special problem in the agricultural-marketing picture and we need to modify our attitudes to insure a decent living for dairymen and a reliable supply for consumers.

We hope Congress will pass the Proxmire bill and its equivalent in the House (Poage bill) and give this system a try. The demands are moderate. The cost to the taxpayer would seem reasonable. There is no provision for direct subsidy in the bills at the present time. Our experience with milk marketing orders which have dominated the dairy market for many years would indicate that the system might work quite well.

There are problems, of course, but they could be worked out. These include such things as transferability of bases, the entry into dairying of new producers, and safeguards against dairying becoming concentrated in a few hands.

Nevertheless a lot of work has gone into this most recent proposal, and Congress might well go along with the plan to see how it will work out.

SHOOTING DOLLARS TO THE MOON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for some time now I have been indicating what I believe to be weaknesses in the U.S. space program. In particular, I have indicated that I think we should not be spending so much money so rapidly